

MINUTES OF THE  
**STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD MEETING**  
JANUARY 18, 2008, 10:00 A.M.  
LAKE HURON ROOM  
MICHIGAN HISTORICAL CENTER

**Board Members Present:**

Scott Beld, Janese Chapman, Lynn Evans, Richard Harms, Alison (Kim) Hoagland, Elizabeth Knibbe, Carolyn Loeb, Jennifer Radcliff

**Board Members Absent:**

n/a

**Staff Members Present:**

Amy Arnold, Laura Ashlee, Nick Bozen, Robert Christensen, Brian Conway, Ted Grevstad-Nordbrock, Martha MacFarlane-Faes, Robbert McKay, Denise Sachau, Diane Tuinstra, Todd Walsh

**Members of the Public Present:**

Aimee D'Agostini, Eastern Michigan University Student  
Kathleen Deighton, Eastern Michigan University Student  
Kristi Gilbert, Eastern Michigan University Student  
Kristine Kidorf, concerning Woodbridge Neighborhood Historic District Boundary Increase Two, Tinlinn Apartments, and Berridge Hotel  
Ron Lud???, concerning Central National Tower  
Robert Marzano, concerning R.T.P. Prose v. City of Northville  
Pat Meyer, concerning Hudsonville Christian School  
Erica Pearson, Eastern Michigan University Student  
Rebecca Binno Savage, concerning Majestic Theater and Garden Bowl  
Andrea Riegler, concerning Central National Tower  
Daniel Schneider, Eastern Michigan University Student  
Lynn Scott, Eastern Michigan University Student  
Andrew Wilhelm, Eastern Michigan University Student  
Jessica Williams, Eastern Michigan University Student  
Joseph Zainea, concerning Majestic Theater

**Approval of Agenda:**

Moved: Harms

Seconded: Knibbe

Vote: 8-0

**Approval of minutes of September 14, 2007:**

Moved: ?

Seconded: Beld

Vote: 8-0

**Election of Officers:**

Conway: The executive order states that the Governor appoints a chairperson for the State Historic Preservation Review Board (Board), which will take effect at the May 2, 2008 meeting. Bozen suggested that the Board continue with the election of officers at this meeting for the purpose of signing documents.

Moved: Knibbe: Moved to retain current officers until the next Board meeting on May 2, 2008

Seconded: Harms

**Staff Reports:**

Brian Conway:

Conway acknowledged the larger-than-usual size of the crowd, which contained

Conway stated that Walsh had returned to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) after briefly working with the Michigan Film Office. Cecelia Cabello will be leaving the SHPO to move to Texas. Tuinstra has returned to work after being out on maternity leave. Martha MacFarlane-Faes is currently out of the office on maternity leave.

Executive Order 2007-53 has been signed by the Governor. Prior to the EO, the SHPO and the Board were both created as a result of the National Historic Preservation Act. Now the SHPO and the Board are now official under State law. According to Bozen, the EO has the same power as a legislative law. The Governor will now be appointing members to the Board. The SHPO will be recommending all current Board members to the Governor for reappointment. The EO calls for nine members, so the SHPO will be looking for other possible nominees. According to the EO, the terms of the Board members are staggered, and then terms of appointment are for four years. The Governor retains discretion for appointing members to the Board, but will work from a list of nominees provided by the SHPO.

The federal budget bill funding for SHPOs will increase a little bit (approximately \$61,000). Though not a lot of money, this amount will keep the SHPO from considering layoffs.

State Senate Bill 973 was introduced in December, which provides technical amendments to the new Michigan Business Tax for historic preservation tax credits, was supported by several senators. The bill clarifies pass-through rules for investors, and strikes out rule in current law that allows a developer who is taking a federal historic preservation tax credit to only be eligible for a five percent state tax credit. This will allow a developer to stack the twenty percent federal and the twenty-five percent state tax credits. This is a result of data that showed that the current state tax credit is inviting for homeowners but not for commercial developers. These changes will provide greater incentive and add another tool that can be used for more difficult projects. These changes are also in line with what other states are doing. Missouri was the first state to do this, and Ohio also has a similar package.

Knibbe asked if there was any similar legislation currently in the State House of Representatives. Conway replied that, according to Bozen, the current bill is in the Senate and is being discussed in the Committee on Commerce and Tourism, and once the Senate committee acts on it, it will be sent to the House. Conway added that the SHPO as provided suggestions for changes.

Senator George is working with the Michigan Historic Preservation Network (MHPN) on legislation that will provide a fee for funding a historic preservation fund. This is a result of testimony to the House and Senate for added support for the SHPO. This bill will add a one-dollar fee to all documents filed with the county register of deeds office. The new fee would increase to fifteen dollars from the current fourteen dollars. Conway added that he does expect some opposition from the real estate industry, but that a substantial historic preservation fund would be created which could be used to assist non-profits and other under-funded rehabilitation projects. Radcliff asked if the bill address how the funds will be administrated and for what purposes, or if it is just a collection of fees. Conway replied that it is currently a collection of fees that will be administered by the SHPO to assist with historic preservation activities. Knibbe asked if the funds could also be used for staff. Conway replied that it could, but the fund created would be more than the SHPO would need for staff, and the overall goal is to assist those projects that currently do not have any mechanism for assistance.

The Governor recently signed a bill that also corrects the Michigan Business Tax. The correction allows insurance companies to act as developers and take advantage of the historic preservation tax credits. This correction is specifically signed to assist with the redevelopment of the Ottawa Street Board of Water and Light building in Lansing.

The Michigan Main Street program is going strong. The SHPO is working with the Department of Environmental Quality to incorporate “green” and LEED building practices into the guidelines of the Main Street program. The SHPO is also looking to expand the four points of the Main Street program to include cultural economic development.

The Certified Local Government program saw some money returned to the SHPO from earlier grantees. The SHPO in turn re-granted that money to the city of Kalamazoo to do repair work on the Kalamazoo Water Tower, and to Washtenaw County to host a series of workshops in coordination with the MHPN.

The Michigan Lighthouse Assistance Program will be funding eight projects totaling \$216,000 in grants, with a total construction cost of \$324,000. This is the largest amount the SHPO has awarded. The SHPO is waiting for the Governor to announce the awardees.

The Michigan Lighthouse Alliance will be hosting the Michigan Lighthouse Conference in Traverse City June 11-14th.

The Governor’s Awards for Historic Preservation ceremony will be held May 15, 2008 at 9:30 at the Michigan State Capitol.

The MHPN conference’s topic this year is relating historic preservation to green building. That conference will be held in early May 2008.

The SHPO’s two Preserve America grants are well underway. Arnold and four student interns have concluded their research work. SHPO staff has been meeting regularly with the Beachtowns organization – the convention and visitors bureau in the eleven communities comprising “Beachtowns.” The Beachtowns are now starting to take ownership of this project. The SHPO has also engaged the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) in designating US 31 as a heritage route. The SHPO will be hosting a series of workshops between now and September 2008. The Idlewild and Mary’s City of David projects are also well under way. Christensen is the SHPO staff lead on these projects. Consultants have been hired for both components of this project. The goal of this Preserve America grant is to obtain National Historic Landmark status, or national level National Register listing as a minimum, for Idlewild, along with a cultural resource management plan and several Michigan Historical Markers. The goal for Mary’s City of David is National Register listing and a Michigan Historical Marker.

The SHPO has been promised a substantial grant from the MDOT that will allow the SHPO to establish a Geographical Information System (GIS) database up and running. The first step is to do process engineering, which will evaluate the SHPO’s methods and see how they can be incorporated into a GIS platform.

Work is still underway on the roof of the Michigan Library and Historical Center. Staff is still restricted from accessing the fifth floor, and the SHPO will likely not be moving back into the building until at least October 2008.

This is the sixth year of the Governor’s Awards for Historic Preservation (GAHP). Every year it gets harder to limit the number of recipients. This year the SHPO is proposing seven projects for awards. Conway gave a brief description of each proposed awardee and the respective project. Conway asked for the Board’s support of these GAHP nominees.

Moved: Hoagland  
Seconded: Harms  
Vote: 8-0

### **National Register Nominations**

**Site:** Central School, Iron River, Iron Co.

**Presented By:** Christensen

**Moved for Approval:** Knibbe

**Seconded:** Radcliff

**Vote:** 8-0

**Criteria:** A, C

**Level of Significance:** Local

Conway asked what the proposed use is. Christensen replied that the developer sought to convert this building to housing.

**Site:** Smith-Dengler House, Franklin Township, Houghton Co.

**Presented By:** Christensen

**Moved for Approval:** Evans

**Seconded:** Hoagland

**Vote:** 8-0

**Criteria:** A, C

**Level of Significance:** Local

Hoagland stated that she has been inside this building and that retains a remarkable degree of integrity. Radcliff asked if the windmill was still in existence. Christensen said he was unsure, and Hoagland stated that the area where the windmill was located is now heavily forested.

**Site:** Marquette & Western Railway Negaunee Depot, Negaunee, Marquette Co.

**Presented By:** Christensen

**Moved for Approval:** Knibbe (with exception e to be noted or not noted depending on response from the National Park Service)

**Seconded:** Loeb

**Vote:** 8-0

**Criteria:** A, C

**Level of Significance:** Local

Radcliff asked for clarification on the location of this depot and an adjacent depot. Christensen replied that when the Marquette & Western was absorbed by another railroad, the new railroad used their own depot as the railroad depot, but that building was demolished, and a brick building was built to replace it. Knibbe asked about whether the building was moved. Christensen replied that the building was turned 180 degrees and moved slightly to the left of its original location. Knibbe stated that the nomination should address the fact that the building was moved. Christensen stated that the move was done in the 1920s. Knibbe replied that regardless of the date of the move, the fact that the building was moved changed its relationship with the railroad tracks and should therefore be addressed. Harms asked if the nominated depot was placed on the site of the demolished depot. Christensen stated that that does not appear to be the case. Harms then asked if the nominated depot was moved to the other side of the railroad tracks. Christensen replied that this was not the case. Loeb stated that it appears that the entrance to the building is at grade, but the other side of the building is raised several feet. She asked if this meant there was an elevation change inside the building. Radcliff stated that one of the photos in the nomination shows a platform. Christensen stated that the platform was an addition by the current occupant of the building. Christensen added that he is not entirely sure why the building was flipped. Harms stated that the nomination should note Exception E, since the building was moved. Christensen replied that this is a gray area because the building was moved,

but it was moved nearly 100 years ago. Harms asked if the building has added significance since the time it was moved. Knibbe stated that this is not a matter of significance, but a matter of categorization because the moving of the building is part of the history of the building. Harms asked if the exception was just to note that building's significance is not diminished but just that it has been moved. Christensen replied that he was unsure, but that he felt he should call the National Park Service for clarification.

**Site:** Hudsonville Christian School, Hudsonville, Kent Co.

**Presented By:** Christensen

**Moved for Approval:** Harms

**Seconded:** Chapman

**Vote:** 8-0

**Criteria:** A, C

**Level of Significance:** Local

**Site:** Willis-Selden Historic District Boundary Increase, Majestic Theater and Garden Bowl, Detroit, Wayne Co.

**Presented By:** Savage

**Moved for Approval (Majestic):** Radcliff

**Seconded (Majestic):** Harms

**Vote (Majestic):** 7-0 Knibbe Abstaining

**Criteria (Majestic):** A; g

**Level of Significance (Majestic):** Local

**Moved for Approval (Garden):** Hoagland

**Seconded (Garden):** Chapman

**Vote (Garden):** 7-0 Knibbe Abstaining

**Criteria (Garden):** A; g

**Level of Significance (Garden):** Local

Evans asked if the Board should proceed with a vote on the Majestic Theater. Harms replied that the Board should vote. Chapman asked if the Board was voting on these properties separately. Harms replied that the Board was indeed voting separately. Knibbe excused herself from voting on the Majestic Theater to avoid any notion of conflict of interest. Knibbe also stated that since these properties were being nominated individually that more documentation and description of the changes made to the interior of the Majestic. Chapman spoke to the concern of the creation of several small districts and the possibility of combining the small districts into one large district. Radcliff asked whether the Board should vote now or wait until a later meeting. Christensen replied that if the nomination changed in any significant way the Board would need to rehear the nomination. Knibbe asked if the Adams-esque plaster feature was pretty much all that is left of the original plaster work. Savage replied that it was all that was left. Knibbe added that when submitting a tax credit application, the building's significance plays a large part in the type of work undertaken. Christensen stated that the exterior façade was focus the building's significance. Christensen added that the features left in the building are all from the original building, and the only noticeable feature from the 1930s was the façade. Chapman stated that she thought there was enough information in the current nomination for the Majestic. Radcliff asked why the Majestic was not being nominated under Criterion A. Christensen replied that he did not see anything compelling in the building's history to warrant nomination under Criterion A. Loeb stated that she felt the façade was well suited to the streetscape, and the Art Deco styling fits the building well.

Radcliff asked if Exception G was noted because of the changes made in 1966. Knibbe excused herself from voting to avoid any notion of conflict of interest. She also stated that the Garden Bowl is a fantastic building.

**Site:** Woodbridge Neighborhood Historic District Boundary Increase Two, Detroit, Wayne Co.

**Presented By:** Kidorf

**Moved for Approval:** Chapman

**Seconded:** Evans

**Vote:** 8-0

**Criteria:** A, C; a

**Level of Significance:** Local

Hoagland asked if the buildings in the expansion boundaries were all built in the 1920s. Kidorf replied that some were built earlier than that, but that all of the apartment buildings were built in the 1920s. Hoagland asked if the commercial buildings in the expansion boundaries were also built in the 1920s, and why they were part of the nomination. Kidorf replied that some of the buildings were built between 1920 and 1930, and that they were discussed in the nomination because of the expansion of commercial activity on Trumbull Avenue during that period. Hoagland asked since the period of significance was expanded why these buildings were not included in the narrative description of the nomination. Kidorf replied that the buildings were discussed in the original nomination. Hoagland stated buildings, though included, were non-contributing. Kidorf replied affirming that was correct, but the earlier nomination did not differentiate between contributing and non-contributing. Hoagland asked if the earlier nomination described the buildings individually or list them individually. Kidorf replied that the nomination did not. Christensen stated that the original nomination did not delineate the buildings in a specific manner. Christensen then added that the original nomination addressed the earlier single family, townhouse, and apartment buildings, but seemed to cut off discussion at 1920, as if to say that any activity in the district ceased at that point.

**Chapman had comments here but could not distinguish on tape.**

Conway stated that it is critical for the nomination to address commercial buildings individually for tax credit purposes because the National Park Service (NPS) may take issue with a building that is not specifically listed in the nomination. Knibbe asked if the original nomination address the various apartment buildings in the district and the importance of those buildings. Chapman stated that the original nomination addressed the fact that there were apartment buildings in the district, but did not provide detail about them individually. Knibbe stated that the church building has enough significance to stand on its own, and with the boundary increase the nomination is dealing with the architectural, but not historical significance of the district, and because the speed at which Detroit grew in the 1920s and 1930s is so significant to its history, it might be worth revisiting the original nomination and expanding the district to include the later buildings. Christensen replied that it was his thought that the church did not stand on its own, and NPS expects the church to have some outstanding architectural or historic importance, and in his opinion this church is very typical. Christensen then added that it was the opinion of Kidorf and himself that the boundary increase contains buildings that should have been included in the original nomination but were not. Knibbe then asked if it was Christensen's opinion that the boundary increase was to serve as a correction to the original nomination. Christensen replied that the case is being made whoever wrote the original nomination was looking at an earlier generation of buildings, but that there are other buildings, today, that are significant. Knibbe then asked why the cutoff date for the boundary increase was 1930? Kidorf replied that there really was not much development after that date. Radcliff asked if someone came to the SHPO with a tax credit project in this district, does the nomination contain enough information to get the project started. Christensen replied that the person submitting the project would have to provide some additional information about their specific building, but the nomination provides the context. Knibbe stated that she was concerned that the nomination explicitly mentions four apartment buildings, but that it should encompass all buildings built before 1930. Harms suggested introducing the discussion of these four buildings by saying "as an example of." Harms added that by limiting the discussion to just four buildings, a potential tax credit project might be denied if it is not one of those four.

**Site:** Tinlinn Apartments, Flint, Genesee Co.

**Presented By:** Kidorf

**Moved for Approval:** Evans

**Seconded:** Radcliff

**Vote:** 8-0

**Criteria:** A

**Level of Significance:** Local

**Site:** Berridge Hotel, Flint, Genesee Co.

**Presented By:** Kidorf

**Moved for Approval:** Knibbe

**Seconded:** ?

**Vote:** 8-0

**Criteria:** A

**Level of Significance:** Local

**Site:** Central National Tower, Battle Creek, Calhoun Co.

**Presented By:** Riegler

**Moved for Approval:** Radcliff

**Seconded:** Harms

**Vote:** 8-0

**Criteria:** C

**Level of Significance:** Local

Conway asked if the two-story banking office was still intact. Riegler replied that it was not, and that there had been significant modifications to the interior of this building, but the interior is well intact. Harms added that it looks a lot better than it did thirty years ago.

**Historic District Committee Study Reports:**

Presented by Arnold

**Broadway Historic District, Ann Arbor**

The Board made no additional comment.

**1011-1013 Broadway Historic District, Ann Arbor**

The Board made no additional comment.

**East Side Bridge Street Historic District, Charlevoix**

Hoagland commented that one of the buildings in the district named by Arnold in the Staff Report lacked a photo of the front façade. Arnold replied that the building in noted by Hoagland was suspect in her opinion as well. Hoagland asked if the building could qualify as a contributing building. Arnold replied that it could be a contributing building if the district was stronger.

**Stockton House Historic District**

The Board made no additional comment.

**Modification of 10234 East Shore (Train Barn) Historic District, Portage**

Hoagland asked if the city was taking vacant land out of the district. Arnold confirmed that the .7 acres being removed from the district is vacant and shielded by forestlands.

**Stiles School Historic District, Rochester Hills**

**Frank Farm Historic District, Rochester Hills**

**Modification of 60 West Wattles Road Historic District (Troy Museum & Historic Village), Troy**

## Appeals:

### Rembert C. Parker v Pontiac Historic District Commission

Knibbe: It is hard to know what is really going on because the Proposal for Decision (PFD) seems to imply that the Historic District Commission (HDC) required the use of Hardy Plank, which would be an inappropriate action on the part of the HDC. Harms: There is not enough information in the Proposal for Decision to make a decision, because it is not clear who said what at what time and what the reasons for such statements might be. Bozen: That is the problem that we all face. One course of action is for the Board to not make a decision at this time, but instead direct Bozen to review the record and draft another Proposal for Decision that contains the amount of detail expected by the Board. The board would then delay making a decision until the next meeting. Knibbe: It sounds like the complainant does not want to use the proposed material. Is there any complaint on his part regarding how the HDC handled the case? Bozen: There are no procedural complaints in this case. He simply feels that a vinyl sided garage is what he needs because he is too old to paint the structure. Harms: The way this reads is that the Board is being expected to take the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) word for details and facts of this case, in which case there would be no need for the Board to act.

Moved: Knibbe: Move that the Board reject the Proposal for Decision in the matter of Rembert C. Parker v Pontiac HDC issued by State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (SOAHR), and direct the Department of History, Arts and Libraries' Office of Regulatory Affairs to draft a new Proposal for Decision including findings of fact and conclusions of law and presented to the Board at a later meeting.

Seconded: Harms

Vote: 8-0

### R.T.P. Prose v Northville Historic District Commission

Harms: It seems to me that, since this is a demolition, it needs to be made clear to him what case he needs to make; what the four conditions are that would allow this to go forward. I don't really see any of that in what he has presented. As I understand it, that is what the decision of the Northville Historic District Commission (HDC) was too, that he needed to return to the HDC more information. Bozen: That was the decision of the HDC, yes. Marzano: It was actually denied, but it was denied due to insufficient information. Knibbe: We do not allow testimony. Hoagland: In Northville's last letter of January 14, they offer to hear Mr. Prose's case again. Knibbe: Can we move to remand the case back to the Northville HDC? Harms: If there has been a decision, and Mr. Prose is appealing that decision to the Board, then the Board has to decide if the appeal has merit or not. Bozen: That is where the case stands. The Northville HDC denied the request on procedural grounds. Though the PFD prepared by the SOAHR ALJ fundamentally agreed with the Northville HDC, but it also addressed meritorious type issues that confuses the PFD quite a bit. Harms: The PFD should be rewritten so that the meritorious issues are not addressed. The sequence and timing of the process is confusing because the demolition permit was not dated. It is not clear what time has expired. Knibbe: If the HDC turned down the application for lack of sufficient information, and the Board does not see any information that would contradict that, then the Board needs to support the decision of the HDC. Harms: The Board needs to leave the decision at that, and not address the meritorious issues. Bozen: There are a lot of good things in this PFD, but there are problems with it too. It does not have enough detail, it does not have enumerated facts, and the conclusions of law are confusing because they address issues that really are not issues. Knibbe: So the Board can support the decision of the HDC and have the PFD rewritten? Bozen: The Board can support the HDC's decision, reject the PFD, and have the PFD rewritten. The Board can vote now to affirm the HDC's decision and have the PFD rewritten based on the discussion of the Board at this time.

Moved: Evans: Accept the Northville Historic District Commission's decision, but direct the Department of History, Arts and Libraries' Office of Regulatory Affairs to draft a new Final Decision and Order reflecting



the Board's decision, including Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and authorize the President of the Board or the President of the newly constituted Board under the newly signed Executive Order to sign and issue the Final Decision and Order on behalf of the Board.

Seconded: Harms

Vote 8-0

Mendelssohn Auguste v Pontiac Historic District Commission

Knibbe: There are two separate issues. The Historic District Commission (HDC) was correct in their findings. The city of Pontiac's Building Department was incorrect in issuing a building permit, so Mr. Auguste may have a separate case against the city's Building Department, but it does not change the validity of the HDC's decision. Evans: The other problem is that the HDC gave Mr. Auguste an "out." Beginning on page 2 the Proposal for Decision (PFD) reads "...at a minimum a decision should be made acknowledging that the petitioner acted wrongly by replacing the windows in the absence of approval by the commission." That seems to say that the HDC will accept what happened. Harms: They are worried about setting a precedent. Bozen: The attorney for the HDC did file exceptions in this case. Harms: When did Mr. Auguste actually receive the notice of the denial? Bozen: It was probably mailed out in June. Bozen: The exceptions say that the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) determination is acceptable with one exception. The HDC disagrees with the ALJ's recommendation that the HDC allow the Petitioner to keep the vinyl replacement windows because of mitigating factors. The HDC argues that this recommendation serves to contravene the HDC's authority and undermines the historic integrity of the neighborhood. It is clear that the ALJ thinks that the Petitioner should have done more than check the HDC's website. Harms: And Mr. Auguste misread the website so he bears some of the responsibility too. Bozen: Any liability can be passed to Hansen's or the city's Building Department. Harms: From what I read, the HDC did its job. Knibbe: Mr. Auguste has a problem with the Building Department. Harms: And the fact that Mr. Auguste misread the agenda. Evans: But even if Mr. Auguste had misread the agenda, if the Building Department had followed the appropriate procedures they could have alerted Mr. Auguste to his mistake. Knibbe: Is this PFD ok? Bozen: This PFD is ok except for the paragraph near the end where the ALJ discusses mitigating factors. Knibbe: Can we just delete that paragraph? Bozen: Yes.

Moved: Harms: Accept findings and conclusions, striking the paragraph on page 18 beginning "The findings which mitigate..." and striking the PFD to reflect that the Board upholds the decision of the Pontiac Historic District Commission.

Vote: 8-0

Evans: We are accepting all findings of fact, that this in fact what happened, but we come to a different conclusion based on those findings of fact. Harms: We are supporting the PHDC in their decision, but the Hearing Officer recommended that that not be the case.

Brian J. Schipper v Saugatuck Historic District Commission

Beld, Chapman, and Harms had not received the Proposal For Decision by the date of the meeting. Bozen explained the case for Beld, Chapman, and Harms. Bozen stated that the Board is not voting on a Proposal For Decision, but on a Order Granting Summary Disposition In Favor Of The Petitioner.

Harms: It seems to me that this has to go back for a hearing. The Petitioner makes an interesting point, but it needs to go back for a hearing.

Moved: Harms: The matter of Brian J. Schipper v Saugatuck Historic District Commission be remanded back to SOAHR for the purpose of conducting a hearing and issuing a Proposal For Decision.

Seconded: Radcliff

Vote: 8-0

Conway asked if Bozen had any comments on PFDs that should go back to SOAHR from the Board. I see four cases here that are essentially delayed. Knibbe: If we can make a recommendation it is that SOAHR consistently assign several people to these cases so that they develop the expertise that is necessary. Harms: Some of them are not doing what they are supposed to be doing, not specific to the case. Evans: If they are supposed to have findings of fact and they do not even have findings of fact, that is a bigger problem than historic preservation expertise. Bozen: The ALJs for SOAHR come from all different disciplines. In one of these cases the ALJ refers to the Petitioner as Claimant. That particular ALJ comes from the workers comp world, where equity is what counts. In historic preservation those kinds of principles do not apply in the same way, if at all. SOAHR has a problem because they have a staff that is based around the state, and they try to assign people on a FIFO basis or an availability basis. That having said that, I will certainly communicate your concern. We had this problem with Glen Ann, and it certainly is not going away, in fact it is getting worse. Knibbe: It makes more work for them. Bozen: It makes more work for me. Conway: It also comes back to the Board because the Board appears as the entity holding up the decision process. Hoagland: We should be a quick step in the process.

**Dates of Next Meeting:**

May 2, 2008

September 12, 2008

January 16, 2009

**Adjournment:**

Adjourned: 1:01 p.m.

Prepared by T. Walsh